

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

#### **I. Review of the Office Action**

Claims 1-10 are objected to because of various informalities. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable<sup>1</sup> over Ejzak (U.S. Patent No. 6,954,654).

#### **II. Preliminary Matters**

##### **A. Foreign Priority**

A certified copy of the Foreign Priority document was filed in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on December 19, 2005. However, the Examiner did not properly acknowledge receipt of the Foreign Priority document by checking box 12(a)(1) of the Office Action Summary. The Examiner is requested to fully acknowledge receipt of the Foreign Priority documents in the next Office Action.

##### **B. Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning copies of the PTO/SB/08 forms submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on May 20, 2004.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant "anticipated", since the Examiner did not use a secondary reference in the rejections nor did the Examiner apply an obviousness-type rejection in the Office Action. The Examiner is requested to clarify this discrepancy.

### **III. Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-10 because of various informalities. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-10 in order to improve clarity. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the objections to the claims.

### **IV. Prior Art rejections**

With respect to independent claim 1, and analogous independent claims 3, 5, and 9, the Examiner asserts that Ejzak discloses all of the features of claim 1, and analogous independent claims 3, 5, and 9. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

Independent claim 1 recites in part:

- b. said call session control Network element (CSCF) upon intercepting said incoming IP multimedia call activating a dedicated primary application server (AS<sub>Prim</sub>);
- c. said primary application server (AS<sub>Prim</sub>), upon analysis of said incoming IP multimedia call presenting said incoming IP multimedia call to said called party terminal (CDPT) together with a set of service applications for answering said incoming call, said set of service applications being determined in said analysis; and
- d. said call session control Network element (CSCF) receiving a selection of at least one service application from said set of service applications forwarded by said called party terminal (CDPT).

These features are also analogously recited in independent claims 3, 5, and 9. Applicant respectfully submits that these features of the claims are not taught or suggested by Ejzak.

Ejzak generally relates to a communication system that can be utilized by circuit-switched and packet-switched mobile units. An IP multimedia Subsystem supports features and

services for mobile units using either circuit-switched and packet-switched or IP multimedia call control procedures (column 1, lines 55-62).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Ejzak of the feature “said call session control Network element (CSCF) upon intercepting said incoming IP multimedia call activating a dedicated primary application server (AS<sub>Prim</sub>)”, as recited in the claim. The Examiner cites column 13, lines 8-11 of Ejzak as allegedly disclosing this feature of the claim. However, this cited portion of Ejzak merely discloses that the CSCF may send standard session initiation protocol (SIP) signaling to one or more application servers in the network. Nowhere does this cited portion (or any other portion) of Ejzak teach or suggest a “call session control Network element (CSCF) upon intercepting said incoming IP multimedia call activating a dedicated primary application server (AS<sub>Prim</sub>)”, as recited in the claim.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Ejzak of “said primary application server (AS<sub>Prim</sub>), upon analysis of said incoming IP multimedia call presenting said incoming IP multimedia call to said called party terminal (CDPT) together with a set of service applications for answering said incoming call, said set of service applications being determined in said analysis”, as recited in the claim. The Examiner cites column 13, lines 11-18 of Ejzak as allegedly disclosing this feature of the claim. However, this cited portion of Ejzak merely discloses that a Serving CSCF (S-CSCF) provides features and services for user equipment through application servers. Nowhere does Ejzak teach or suggest that a primary application server, upon analysis of an incoming IP multimedia call presents the incoming IP multimedia call to a called party terminal (CDPT) together with a set of service applications for answering the incoming call, as required by the claim.

Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Ejzak of the feature “said call session control Network element (CSCF) receiving a selection of at least one service application from said set of service applications forwarded by said called party terminal (CDPT)”, as recited in the claim. The Examiner cites column 16, lines 15-26 of Ejzak as allegedly disclosing this feature of the claim. However, this cited portion of Ejzak simply discloses various methods that may be applied for invoking specific features for supplementary services. An interworking Mobile Switching center initiates standard SIP call control procedures in response to the appearance of a feature invocation condition or forwards a feature invocation indication to the S-CSCF to cause the S-CSCF to begin SIP procedures to realize the feature. Nowhere does Ejzak teach or suggest that a call session control network element receives a selection of at least one service application from a set of applications forwarded by a called terminal as required by the claims.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, 3, 5, and 9 should be allowable because the cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. Claims 2, 4, 6-8, and 10 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 3, 5, and 9.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Mark E. Wallerson  
Registration No. 59,043

Date: February 7, 2008